



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,919	02/08/2001	Yasunobu Hashimoto	1466.1029	5835
21171	7590	03/05/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			AWAD, AMR A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	6

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,919

Applicant(s)

HASHIMOTO, YASUNOBU

Examiner

Amr Awad

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Betsui et al. (US patent NO. 5,825,128; hereinafter referred to as Betsui) in view of Shigeta (US patent NO. 5,659,226).

As to independent claim 1, Betsui a method for displaying an image on a plasma display (figure 3) that includes, using a display device having a display surface (11) including plural cell columns each of which is a set of cells having the same light emission color, the display device having a cell arrangement structure in which cell positions in the column direction are shifted from each other between the neighboring cell columns (col. 4, lines 17-48).

Betsui does not expressly teach performing an interlaced display by changing the combination of cells of a display line that is perpendicular to the column direction in every field between the neighboring cell columns of the same light emission color.

However, Shigeta teaches a plasma display device that includes interlacing (between the odd and the even lines) by changing the combination of cells of display that is perpendicular to the column direction in every field between the neighboring cell

Art Unit: 2675

columns of the same light emission color (figures 5-6, 7, col. 5, lines 7-54 and col. 6, lines 23-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Shigeta interlacing by changing the combination of the cells of the display, to be incorporated to Betsui's device so as motivated by Shigeta, to increase in fineness of the display (abstract), and to make it easier to precisely manufacturing the row electrodes in excess of a patterning precision and width of the electrodes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

As to claim 2, the specification of the invention does not specify what is the virtual display surface. Therefore, the luminance cited in Shigeta's reference (col. 6, lines 23-38) fairly reads on the claim because the virtual display can be the medium in which the display is observed.

As to claim 3, the claim is an apparatus claim corresponds to method claim 1 and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to claim 4, figures 4A, 4B and 5A of Betsui's device fairly reads on the constant pitch of claim 3 (see Betsui, col. 6, lines 24-39).

As to claim 5, the specification of the invention does not specify what is the virtual display surface. Therefore, the luminance cited in Shigeta's reference (col. 6, lines 23-38) fairly reads on the claim because the virtual display can be the medium in which the display is observed.

As to claim 6, having a single color display is well known in the art of plasma display, which what is disclosed in claim 6.

As to claim 7, as can be seen in both references; the displays have different emission colors (see 4A of Betsui and figure 6 of Shigeta).

As to claim 8, the arrangement of Shigeta (figures 6 and 10) fairly reads on claim 8; see column 5, lines 7-48).

As to claims 9-10, as can be seen in figures 8; Shigeta shows an interlaced image being converted to an interlaced image (col. 6, lines 23-37).

As to claim 11, as seen above; both Betsui and Shigeta teach a plasma display device.

As to claim 12, Betsui (figures 3, 4A) teaches partition (wall 29) for dividing a discharge space for each cell column, and the discharge space is continuous over the entire length of the display surface (col. 4, lines 10-36).

As to claim 13, as can be seen in figure 1 of Betsui's device, the scanning electrodes (X & Y) are arranged to straddle over all columns for selecting one cell in each cell column of each field (4, lines 18-26).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the argument for the rejection under 112-second paragraph rejection; the rejection has been withdrawn. The explanation however, in which it was provided by the Applicant was broad enough to read on the cited references. Examiner considers the virtual display surface being a set of cells arranged in the same form as

Art Unit: 2675

an arrangement of an input data, as simply the image provided on the display, which corresponds to the input image.

Applicant (page 7) admits that the teachings of Betsui are consistent with the structure of the present invention. However, Applicant argued that the present invention recites, "performing interlace display" which is not taught or suggested by Betsui. Examiner respectfully submits that the rejection above is based on the combination of two references (Betsui and Shigeta). As clearly described in the rejection above, Betsui does not expressly teach performing an interlaced display by changing the combination of cells of a display line that is perpendicular to the column direction in every field between the neighboring cell columns of the same light emission color. However, Shigeta teaches a plasma display device that includes interlacing (between the odd and the even lines) by changing the combination of cells of display that is perpendicular to the column direction in every field between the neighboring cell columns of the same light emission color (figures 5-6, 7, col. 5, lines 7-54 and col. 6, lines 23-38). Therefore, Examiner firmly believes that the combination of Betsui and Shigeta reads on the invention as claimed.

Applicant (page 8) recited paragraphs 40 and 46-48 of the current application to show that Betsui lacks such limitations. the examiner respectfully submits that the he did not reject the specification, rather the invention a claimed was broad enough to read on the cited art. Applicant (end of page 8) argued that Shigeta fails to teach that an interlaced display is performed on a display surface where positions of neighboring cells are shifted from each other. Examiner respectfully submits that applicant cannot attack

Art Unit: 2675

the references individually without considering the combination as whole. Examiner's position is simply saying that if the interlace teaching of Shigeta's device is applied to the structure of Betsui, then the modified device would fairly read on the invention as claimed.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amr Awad whose telephone number is (703)308-8485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, between 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached on (703)305-9720. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2675

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-4750.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amir Ahmed". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

A.A.
March 3, 2004